

CONSERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING JANUARY 17, 2012
CONFERENCE ROOM L 101

These minutes are not verbatim, but represent a summary of major statements and comments. For minutes verbatim, refer to audiotapes on file in the Office of the Town Clerk. Audiotapes are retained for the minimum period required under the retention schedule as provided under Connecticut Law.

Chairman Block called the roll call at 7:01 p.m. and noted Commissioners Clark, Igielski , Shapiro and Zelek were present. Also present were Alternate Paskewich and Chris Greenlaw, Town Engineer.

NOTE: Chairman Block designated that Alternate Paskewich would vote for vacant position.

ITEM III

Resolution-Anthony Ferraro, P.E.

Chairman Block read the resolution into the record.

Chairman Block presented the resolution to Mr. Ferraro.

ITEM IV

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of October 18, 2011

Commissioner Igielski noted a quorum of Commission members present at the October 18th meeting are not present at tonight's meeting. He noted that a vote could never be taken because the term of one of the four (4) required votes terminated on November 30, 2011.

Chairman Block suggested that the matter be referred to the Town Attorney for guidance.

It was the consensus of Commission members to refer the matter over to the Town Attorney.

It was the consensus of Commission members to carry the item over to its February meeting.

Regular Meeting of December 20, 2011

Commissioner Zelek noted at the top of Page 5, remark by Commissioner Zelek should read "Commissioner Zelek said that he does not have (had) an issue with the additional....was no other available area."

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to accept the minutes as amended and was seconded by Commissioner Zelek. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM V

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: NONE

ITEM VI

PUBLIC HEARING

Application 2011-10, 181 Patricia Genova Drive, Map Amendment

Commissioner Igielski asked that the legal notice for the public hearing be read into the record.

Commission went into recess at 7:12 p.m.

Commission came out of recess at 7:17 p.m.

Mr. Chris Greenlaw, Town Engineer, noted that the legal notice appeared in the Hartford Courant on January 5th and January 12, 2012. He then read the notice into the record.

Mr. Raymond Gradwell, PE, Project Engineer, BL Companies and representing the applicant (Hartford Hospital) noted the presence of Mr. Steve Alexandre, and Mr. Jeffrey Shamus and entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. The property is located at 181 Patricia Genova Drive
- B. The area under discussion lies in the vicinity of the existing parking area in front of the Curtis building.
- C. The area under study was the 100 foot wide strip of land outside the slope limit of the existing parking lot.
- D. The Town Map does not show any existing wetland in this area.
- E. The area under study which is a (depression) low point fed by storm water; is 850 square feet in size with some trees and impacted by water and sanitary sewer lines.

Mr. Greenlaw noted the source of the source of the storm water is from an existing (closed conduit) pipe system.

Mr. Jeffrey Shamas, Soil Scientist with BL Companies entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. The wetlands limits were delineated using State (of Connecticut) criteria in September 2011 and the site was visited again after last month's meeting.
- B. Photos were reviewed showing the wetland in the concave depression and surrounding area.
- C. The Soil Conservation Service maps are not accurate for mapping due to their small scale.
- D. Soil data was collected in the field using an auger. Soil samples were taken at a depth between 24 inches and 30 inches. Each soil cross section from the auger was looked at for color and water movement.

Mr. Gradwell passed out the photographs to Commission members.

Commissioner Igielski asked the following questions?

- A. What is the size of the land parcel? Mr. Gradwell responded 45 acres.
- B. Was a survey done of the entire parcel of land? Mr. Gradwell responded only the 100 foot wide strip outside the edge of development.
- C. Would the existing parking be reconstructed and paved? Mr. Gradwell responded yes.
- D. Is it possible that there might be some wetland soils under the existing pavement? Mr. Gradwell responded that he doubted it.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that borings were taken in the existing parking lot. Mr. Gradwell noted that he did not see any evidence of wetland soils.

Commissioner Igielski asked if the only wetland found is shown on the map? Mr. Gradwell responded yes.

Chairman Block noted the State soil information appears to be the same through out the field.

Mr. Shamas responded that he disagreed. He did some additional field testing outside the area of the study area and found some evidence of wetland soils.

Chairman Block said the soils within the entire field (in his opinion) qualify as wetlands. Therefore, there is reason to look over the larger area.

Mr. Shamas noted that water from the depression flows into an upland area beyond the scope of work associated with this project. No work (associated with this project) would be done in the area of the other wetland.

Chairman Block asked for a quick over view on how the ground water would be contributing in the area? Mr. Shamas said that he looked at the soil molding and noted in September 2011 when there was no precipitation, the water level was between 4.5 and 5 inches below the ground surface. In January 2012 the water level was within 2.0 inches ground surface.

Chairman Block asked what is the ecological value of the wetland patch to the habitat relative to the developed area? Mr. Shamas responded the area would provide some shade and cover for the local habitat.

Commissioner Igielski asked Mr. Shamas if he would provide the Commission with a signed copy of the map that was included in application package? Mr. Shamas responded yes.

PUBLIC IN FAVOR: NONE

PUBLIC AGAINST: NONE

Motion made by Commissioner Clark to close the Public Hearing and was seconded Alternate Paskewich. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VII A

Application 2012-01, 4 Mountain View Drive

Mr. Greenlaw entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. A complaint was received that work was being done within a regulated area.
- B. A visit to the site and a review of the Town Map revealed that the site was within a wetland and Mill Brook.
- C. A contractor had made an emergency repair (installation of a section of new pipe) to correct a sanitary sewer lateral problem to the house.
- D. The property owner and contractor were not aware that the property was within a regulated area.
- E. He advised the property owner that a permit was requires for the work and an application is before you tonight.

Ms. Kathleen McMahon, the applicant, noted that the contractor said that he would take care of all permits. She would do what the Commission requires to make the property satisfactory.

Ms. McMahon noted there was a problem with the line and had Roto-Rooter come in and clean the line. She was advised that the cleaning was a temporary measure and that a section of pipe should be replaced, which was done.

Commissioner Igielski asked if all the work had been done? Ms. McMahon responded that the landscaping would be done in the spring.

Chairman Block asked the following questions:

- A. What has been done for soil erosion? Mr. Greenlaw responded that silt fence had been installed.
- B. What is the topography in the area? Mr. Greenlaw responded the area is flat.
- C. Is the silt fence adequate for the field condition? Mr. Greenlaw responded yes.

Chairman Block suggested that some burlap should be placed over the area of disturbance (as a temporary measure).

Mr. Greenlaw noted that no action would be taken tonight.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to carry the item over to the February meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Shapiro. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VII B

Application 2012-02, CDM-MDC, Various Town Wide Locations

Mr. Michael Mancini, Director of Engineering, for the MDC noted that the improvements being proposed under this application are required under an agreement with the federal government under the Clean Water Act. The primary activities would include the lining of some existing (sanitary) sewer lines and manholes to reduce infiltration into the pipes and manholes and improve (sanitary) sewer flow and capacity. The project director will make a presentation on the proposed scope of work.

Ms. Katelyn Biedron, Project Engineer with CDM, noted that a study was done of existing lines to determine where problems existed. The proposed scope work (previously noted) would not result in the digging up of any pipes. A number of manholes covers with holes would be replaced with solid tops.

Mr. Dwight R. Dunk, Soil Scientist with CDM, entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. Using a pictorial diagram, he explained the source of water and how it would enter into the sewer lines (listen to audio tape for details of his remarks).
- B. He noted that the proposed scope of work that would occur within regulated areas would involve 33 manholes and connecting pipes.

- C. Using the plan sheet for the Cambridge Drive area from the application, he showed an area where lining activities would take place.
- D. He noted that the lining process for the existing sewer lines starts with the cleaning of the inside of the sewer line. A felt material impregnated with resin in the shape of a tube sock would be passed through the pipe between manholes. The sock would be filled with hot water to seal the liner to the surface of the pipe. After the curing process is completed, the water is then released into the sewer system.
- E. All work would be done within an existing MDC easement area or from the street through the rear yard to the manhole. The intention is not to cut any trees.
- F. Manhole lining would be done by laborers and one or two (2) wheel barrels. In addition four manhole frames would be replaced.
- G. There should be no ground disturbance or pruning of trees.
- H. If the MDC is unable to secure a temporary easement across private property for access to a manhole for the truck and trailer, the MDC would have to use its easement or right of way. This would result in ground damage.
- I. Where a manhole frame would be replaced, silt fence would be installed around the work area.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that this is a unique application. He noted in a letter to Ms. Biedron, the questions in the letter mimic the ones he had raised at last month's meeting.

Mr. Greenlaw said he was looking for controls and means that the contractor would be working under (relative to restoration work). The applicant (consultant to the MDC) is seeking one permit from the Commission for all of the work to be done in Town.

Mr. Mancini entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. The MDC has investigated problem locations in Town. A street study was done eight (8) years ago.
- B. The lining of these existing pipes is an economic way to increase their life expectancy by 50 years.
- C. Over 500,000 feet of pipe in the system has been relined by the MDC.

Alternate Paskewich asked the following questions:

- A. When would the work start: Ms. Biedron responded depending on the weather. Mr. Mancini added when the ground is not soft. In addition, the temperature of the water

used to fill the sock in the pipe is weather sensitive. The contractor, (where private property would be crossed), would contact a property owner prior to the start of work.

- B. What are the pipe sizes that would be involved in the lining process? Ms. Biedron responded between 8 inches and 24 inches.
- C. Does the relining of the pipes reduce inside diameter of the pipe? Ms. Biedron responded yes, but slightly. The process results in the increase in the strength of the pipe, eliminates the infiltration of outside water and there is an increase in sewer flow capacity.

Mr. Mancini noted that the MDC has 15 years to complete the program (2021) per the agreement with the federal government.

Commission went into recess at 8:13 p.m.

Commission came out of recess at 8:20 p.m.

Chairman Block asked the following questions:

- A. Will the curing of the resin in the pipes result in the release of chemicals into the air? Mr. Mancini responded yes. There have been some complaints about a smell in the air. However, the process is safe. At the down slope manhole a 15 foot high vertical shaft pipe is placed in the manhole to release the fumes. Nothing would end up in the wetland.
- B. How would a manhole frame be replaced? Mr. Dunk responded the area around the existing frame would be excavated by hand to a depth of one to two (2) feet and material stored within the work area. The frame would be replaced and the area would be backfilled with the excavated material.
- C. Are some of the locations in the middle of a marsh area? Mr. Dunk responded that some are in wetlands.

Ms. Biedron noted that some of the proposed manhole frame replacements in wetlands have been removed from the project and would be done in the out years.

Mr. Greenlaw said that before any work is done on private property, he would need to have a signed copy of the (permission) letter (in hand) for the record.

Commissioner Igielski asked what would happen if the contractor ran into a broken pipe? Mr. Mancini responded that all lines have been viewed by television camera.

Chairman Block noted that the restoration section is not all applicable to this work.

Mr. Greenlaw noted that his letter addresses the Chairman's remark. He is requesting 1 inch = 40 feet plan in place of the plans submitted with the application. More detail should be added to the new plan sheets on how to address any repair work and/or additional work.

Alternate Paskewich asked who would over see the work? Mr. Mancini responded the work would be over seen by MDC inspectors.

Commissioner Igielski noted the date affixed to the application is 12-10-2012.

Ms.Biedron noted that the date should be 1-10-2012.

Commissioner Clark asked if all property owners have signed permission papers? Ms. Biedron responded that work is still in progress. If person should say no, then we can work through that manhole.

Mr. Dunk said the assumption is being made that all manholes would be used.

Mr. Mancini noted that the MDC has the right to use its easements. There would be less damage if the work could be done through the back yard from the street.

Alternate Paskewich asked if the (sewer) lateral lines have been assessed by camera? Mr. Mancini responded yes. However, a technique has not been developed to address the lateral lines. There are several pilot programs in effect.

Chairman Block raised the question on the possibility on acting tonight on the need for a public hearing on the application. Mr. Mancini noted that the project would involve a minor disturbance of .10acre and in his opinion would require no public hearing. It was noted that the public is allowed two (2) weeks to submit a petition for a public hearing. There was a discussion by delaying action tonight; what could be the effect on the bidding process and the starting of work. It was also noted that not all of the permission slips for property access have been secured by the MDC (listen to audio tape for the details of the discussion). At the conclusion of the discussion, Commissioner Zelek said that he did not see the need for a public hearing.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to carry the item over to the February meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Zelek. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VIII A

Application 2011-10, 181 Patricia Genova Drive, Map Amendment

Chairman Block asked if the application was complete? Mr. Greenlaw responded yes.

Chairman Block asked if suggested reasons for the application were included in the agenda package? Mr. Greenlaw responded yes.

Commissioner Igielski noted a soil scientist was retained to determine if there was any wetland area outside the outer limits of proposed activities. A wetland area was found and an application was submitted to amend the Town Map.

Commissioner Igielski requested that “Suggested Reason B” be revised to read “Applicant has retained a soil scientist, Jeffrey R. Shamas of BL Companies (Environmental Research Group), who has physically located wetland soils in the field and has certified on a map as being true and correct wetlands by signing his name thereon.”

There was a general discussion among Commission members (listen to audio tape for details of the discussion).

It was the consensus of Commission members to accept the proposed changes to “Suggested Reason B”.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski that the Commission after a review of the application and supporting documentation, Public Hearing held January 17, 2011 and closed on January 17, 2011, and subsequent discussion by Commission members, make a finding in Application 2011-10 and issue a permit by Plenary Ruling for reasons stated in the record (audio tape) or “Official Notification of Action”. Motion was seconded by Alternate Paskewich. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VIII B

Application 2011-11, 181 Patricia Genova Drive

Chairman Block asked if the application was complete? Mr. Greenlaw responded yes.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski that based on the information before it, the Commission make a finding of fact that a public hearing is not necessary for Application 2011-11 because the proposed activities would not have a major impact or significant effect on the regulated areas. Motion seconded by Commissioner Clark. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

Commissioner Igielski noted a copy of the suggested conditions was included in the agenda package.

There was a general discussion and review of the conditions among Commission members.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to grant a permit by Summary Ruling for Application 2011-11 and subject to conditions noted in the record (audio tape) or “Official Notification of Action”. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Shapiro. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VIII C

Chairman Block-New Initiative (Evasive Plants)

Chairman Block asked if any Commission members had any remarks to present at this time.

Commissioner Clark noted that she reviewed the web site for the Connecticut Evasive Work Group and read its mission statement into the record (listen to audio tape for mission statement).

Alternate Paskewich noted that he would be meeting with a representative from the Connecticut Agricultural Experimental Station to discuss the matter in the near future.

Chairman Block noted that these plants are of a concern to the Town. The next step would be to pursue a vehicle to start in the spring (of 2012).

Chairman Block suggested that we could check with the schools and/or scouts to see if there was any interest in the study.

Commission went into recess at 9:12 p.m.

Commission came out of recess at 9:19 p.m.

Commissioner Clark noted that this might be a job for one dedicated person. Someone could look into this option and get back to us.

Chairman Block said that he would be in favor in working with a larger group, if there is interest.

Mr. Greenlaw said that one should look to developing a course of direction before moving forward with talking points.

Chairman Block said there appears to be interest in developing a list of (evasive) species and their (possible) impact (on the regulated areas).

Alternate Paskewich said that he would be meeting with a scientist to address these questions. He may have a report available for next month's meeting.

Commissioner Clark noted that she has a degree in "Ecology" and noted (in her opinion) this study would manifest a substantial undertaking.

Commissioner Zelek noted that before moving forward, the Commission needs a road map for direction.

Commissioner Shapiro said the Commission needs to start slowly to get a sense of direction.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to carry the item over to the February meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Shapiro. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VII

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Rose Lyons, 46 Elton Drive noted the continued use of an inadequate recording system for Commission meetings. She also expressed a frustration of the unwillingness of government (agencies) to accept responsibility for maintenance of the marsh land behind her home. This Commission should go to the Town Council for money for the proposed “Evasive Plant Study”. More co-ordination is needed on the “Study”.

ITEM VIII

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

- A. Mr. Greenlaw noted that “Notices of Violation” were sent to properties located on Day Street, Brookside Road and Willard Avenue. Applications should be forth coming.
- B. Mr. Greenlaw noted that he is in possession two (2) “Training Tapes for Commissioners” and are available for Commission member use from his office. He also noted that the schedule for “Training Sessions 1 and 2 for Commission Members” is now available on line.

Motion made by Commissioner Igielski to adjourn meeting at 9:45 p.m. and was seconded by Alternate Paskewich. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and motion was carried.

Peter M. Arburr, Recording Secretary

Commission Members

Tayna Lane, Town Clerk

Town Manager John Salamone

Edmund Meehan, Town Planner

Councilor Myra Cohen

Chairperson, Town Plan and Zoning

Peter Borman, Esquire, Town Attorney

Chris Greenlaw, Town Engineer

Lucy Robbins Wells Library (2)